

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, February 28, 1996.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, House
of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I would like to inform
you that I am resigning from my committee
assignment on the House Agriculture Com-
mittee.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

CYNTHIA MCKINNEY,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without
objection, the resignation is accepted.
There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO SUN- DRY STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speak-
er, I offer a privileged resolution (H.
Res. 367) and ask for its immediate con-
sideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as fol-
lows:

H. RES. 367

Resolved, That the following named Mem-
bers be, and they are hereby, elected to the
following standing committees of the House
of Representatives:

To the Committee on Transportation and
Infrastructure, Tom Sawyer of Ohio, Gene
Taylor of Mississippi;

To the Committee on Science, Harold
Volkmer of Missouri, to rank directly below
Mr. Brown of California; Bart Gordon of Ten-
nessee, to rank directly below Mr. Hall of
Texas;

To the Committee on International Rela-
tions, Charlie Rose of North Carolina, Pat
Danner of Missouri;

To the Committee on Banking and Finan-
cial Services, Cynthia McKinney of Georgia.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on
the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENT TO OFFER ON TOMORROW A MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 956, COMMONSENSE PROD- UCT LIABILITY AND LEGAL RE- FORM ACT OF 1995

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, pursu-
ant to rule XXVIII, I hereby announce
my intention to offer a motion to in-
struct conferees on H.R. 956 tomorrow.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. CONYERS moves that the managers on
the part of the House at the conference on
the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on
the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 956 be
instructed to insist upon the provisions con-
tained in section 107 of the House bill.

ORDER OF AMENDMENTS ON H.R. 2854, AGRICULTURAL MARKET TRANSITION ACT

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. President, I ask
unanimous consent that my amend-
ment, which is in order to be the fourth
amendment to the farm bill, H.R. 2854,
be in order instead after the Solomon-
Dooley amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there
objection to the request of the gen-
tleman from Missouri?

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, reserv-
ing the right to object, the gentleman
from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] and I
have discussed this at length. I think
the gentleman has made a very reason-
able request.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reserva-
tion of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there
objection to the request of the gen-
tleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL MARKET TRANSITION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursu-
ant to House Resolution 366 and rule
XXIII, the Chair declares the House in
the Committee of the Whole House on
the State of the Union for the consider-
ation of the bill, H.R. 2854.

□ 1310

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself
into the Committee of the Whole House
on the State of the Union for the con-
sideration of the bill (H.R. 2854) to
modify the operation of certain agri-
cultural programs, with Mr. YOUNG of
Florida in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the
rule, the bill is considered as having
been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from
Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] and the gen-
tleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA]
each will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman
from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield
myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, at long last the House
of Representatives will now consider a
farm bill, and in this regard I would
like to make some commentary as to
the reasons why we on the Republican
side adopted the policy approach that
we have.

In that regard I think, unfortunately,
during most of the debate in this re-
gard to this year's farm bill, much of
the rhetoric has ignored several basic
facts. There are dramatic changes tak-
ing place that involve U.S. agriculture.
Farmers are competing for increased
demand in a growing global market-
place.

The Congress is serious, finally,
about a balanced budget. The political
climate will not permit any rubber-
stamped acceptance of status quo poli-
cies in agriculture or anywhere else.
Farmers and ranchers know, boy do
they know, the current farm program
is outdated and in need of reform.

So the question is, what kind of pol-
icy takes these givens into account and
makes sense? After conducting 19 hear-
ings, traveling over 60,000 miles, and
listening to over 10,000 farmers and
ranchers, agribusiness men and women,
and many others involved in agri-
culture, this is what farm country told
us: One, they are sick and tired of regu-
latory overkill and demand regulatory

reform; two, they strongly support a
balanced budget. They know a balanced
budget will save agriculture and farm-
ers and ranchers \$15 billion in lower
production costs. They also requested a
consistent and aggressive export pro-
gram, and they want more flexibility
and ability to respond to market sig-
nals and to make their own financial
decisions.

So taking all of these points into ac-
count, we have proposed an innovative
approach to farm program policy. It
has received the most debate of any
farm program proposal in modern his-
tory. It was originally called freedom
to farm, and is now before us as the Ag-
ricultural Market Transition Act.

Let me explain the policy rationale.
The original New Deal farm programs
over 60 years ago were based on prin-
ciples of supply management. If you
control supply, you raise prices. Over
the last 20 years, the principal jus-
tification for the programs has been
that farmers received Federal assist-
ance in return for setting aside a por-
tion of their wherewithal, that is, their
acreage.

□ 1315

That assistance was largely in the
form of something we called deficiency
payments to compensate farmers for
prices below a Government-set target
price for their production. Today, un-
fortunately, that system has collapsed
as an effective way to deliver assist-
ance to farmers.

Worldwide agricultural competition
takes our markets when we reduce pro-
duction. The more we set aside, the
more our competitors overseas simply
increase their production by more than
we set aside. They steal our market
share. In short, the supply manage-
ment rationale not only fails under
close scrutiny by the many critics of
ag policy, it has enabled our competi-
tors to increase their production and
we lose the market share.

As I have indicated, the Freedom to
Farm Act, Agriculture Market Transi-
tion Act, was born of an effort to cre-
ate a new farm policy from an entirely
new perspective. Acknowledging that
budget cuts were inevitable, that we
must meet our budget responsibilities,
freedom to farm set up new goals and
new criteria for farm policy.

No. 1, get the Government out of
farmers' fields. No longer do you put
the seed in the ground to protect your
acreage base to receive a Government
subsidy. Return to farmers the ability
to produce for the markets, not the
Government programs. And to provide
a predictable and guaranteed phasing
down of Federal financial assistance.

By removing Government controls on
land use, freedom to farm effectively
eliminates the No. 1 complaint of farm-
ers about the programs: bureaucratic
redtape, paperwork, all of the regula-
tions and the Government interference.
Endless waits at the county ASCS of-
fice or the SCS office will end. Hassles
over field sizes, whether the right crop